Info-Hams Digest   Sat, 4 Jun 94   Volume 94 : Issue 625

Today's Topics:
                  ** WAITING PERIOD FOR LICENSE ?? **
                           30L-1 to 500C
                      440 in So. Cal. (4 msgs)
                         Dallas Ham fest?
                    Ham Radio few problem (2 msgs)
                           Loop Antenna

Date: Fri, 3 Jun 1994 22:35:27 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!usc!cs.utexas.edu!csc.ti.com!tilde.csc.ti.com!cauldron!
serafin@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: ** WAITING PERIOD FOR LICENSE ?? **
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

Merle Rutschke (al372@cleveland.Freenet.Edu) wrote:

: TO ALL:

: Does anyone reading this message know the current waiting period
: for the no-code Tech license from the FCC?

12 weeks. KC5GRW received his Tech license, TODAY, which marked the exact end
of 12 weeks from the date on which the exam was taken.

Mike

KC5GRW

Date: 4 Jun 94 13:15:49 MDT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!dog.ee.lbl.gov!hellgate.utah.edu!cc.usu.edu!
der@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: 30L-1 to 500C
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

I am trying to connect a Collins 30L-1 to a Swan-500C.
The connection for the antenna relay . . . 1 pin goes to the gound,
what does the other pin got on the 500C?

Please reply to Dave Rhodes   DER@cc.usu.edu

Date: Sat, 4 Jun 1994 19:34:45 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!agate!library.ucla.edu!csulb.edu!csus.edu!netcom.com!
rogjd@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: 440 in So. Cal.
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

Michael P. Deignan (md@pstc3.pstc.brown.edu) wrote:

: Oh, I understand perfectly. You want something for nothing. Gimme, gimme,
: gimme "OPEN" repeaters so I can yak all day and not have to pay anything.

: MD
: --

More silly name calling Mike. "Gimme gimme gimme....." Gosh, your article
reads like my kid in a playground. Can't we elevate this thread above
this level of drivel? Reading your article above makes me picture you
jumping up and down and sticking out your tongue. Let's cut that sort of
stuff out, hey?

73
--
                                    rogjd@netcom.com
                                    Glendale, CA
                                    AB6WR

Date: Sat, 4 Jun 1994 19:36:59 GMT

From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!agate!library.ucla.edu!csulb.edu!csus.edu!netcom.com!
rogjd@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: 440 in So. Cal.
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

Michael P. Deignan (md@pstc3.pstc.brown.edu) wrote:
: rogjd@netcom.com (Roger Buffington) writes:

: > And I think that your use of
: > derogatory terms such as "no-clue technicians" to describe a whole class
: > of operators is reprehensible, especially in a public forum. The new
: > Techs in our area are mainly FB ops, many of whom are actively engaged in
: > upgrading to General thru Extra.

: I believe the term "no clue" applies to dozens of CB transplants that
: infiltrate the hobby, and lend credence to despicable activities like
: jamming that the hobby would have unanimously denounced years ago.

: You conveniently edited out the portion of my message where I indicated
: that no-code techs comprise the largest license class of operator on
: my "closed" machine.

: MD

Sorry old chap, but I plead "not guilty" to changing the spirit of your
article by editing it. You said it the way I quoted it, and perhaps calm
retrospection has caused you to see that your remarks were
inappropriate. Glad you do.

73
--
                                        rogjd@netcom.com
                                        Glendale, CA
                                        AB6WR

Date: Sat, 4 Jun 1994 21:43:31 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!dog.ee.lbl.gov!agate!library.ucla.edu!csulb.edu!csus.edu!
netcom.com!joejarre@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: 440 in So. Cal.
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

Michael P. Deignan (md@pstc3.pstc.brown.edu) wrote:

: The same is true of this area. But, of the 3000+ hams in RI, what
: percentage do you think have dual-band radios? Most new hams purchase
: a 2 meter radio by default, and don't even get on 440mhz until they

: have "discovered" the band, usually through the help of a friend who
: has a dual-band radio.

That's an interesing comment that may be area related. My conversations
with at least one of the national mail order retailers suggests that the
vast majority of hand held amateur radios sold today are 2 meter/440 MHz
dual band radios. Don't know if its true or not . . .
--
****
* Joe Jarrett, K5FOG | *
* joejarre@netcom.com | This area   *
* Information Storage Devices FAE | intentionally left blank   *
* Austin, Texas | *
****

Date: Sat, 4 Jun 1994 22:02:15 GMT
From: brunix!pstc3.pstc.brown.edu!md@uunet.uu.net
Subject: 440 in So. Cal.
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

rogjd@netcom.com (Roger Buffington) writes:

> Sorry old chap, but I plead "not guilty" to changing the spirit of your
> article by editing it. You said it the way I quoted it, and perhaps calm
> retrospection has caused you to see that your remarks were
> inappropriate. Glad you do.

My statements posted to USENET are never inappropriate.

I've had this same argument with dozens of other people over several
years in this same newsgroup, so let's do them all a favor and move it
to e-mail if you think my term "no-clue" is 'inappropriate' and save
them the drudgery of rereading all the same arguments which they
themselves posted years ago.

Some people really have no clue.

MD
--
-- Michael P. Deignan
-- Amalgamated Baby Seal Poachers Union, Local 101
-- "Get 'The Club'... Endorsed by Baby Seal poachers everywhere..."

Date: Fri, 3 Jun 1994 17:57:35 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!usc!cs.utexas.edu!csc.ti.com!tilde.csc.ti.com!cauldron!
ra.csc.ti.com!usenet@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Dallas Ham fest?
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

> I am looking for some information about a Ham fest that will be hold in
> the Dallas Tx area in June. Does anyone know where and when?
>
> Thanks.

David: Dallas' HAM-COM will be held during the weekend of June
10-12 at the Arlington (TX)Convention Center.
73,
Bob Winn, W5KNE, etc.

Date: Sat, 4 Jun 1994 19:30:20 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!usc!howland.reston.ans.net!europa.eng.gtefsd.com!
library.ucla.edu!csulb.edu!csus.edu!netcom.com!rogjd@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Ham Radio few problem
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

Michael P. Deignan (md@pstc3.pstc.brown.edu) wrote:
: rogjd@netcom.com (Roger Buffington) writes:

: The impression I've gotten is that you reject both of these concepts.
: That, to me, indicates you want a free ride at other people's expense.

: MD

Comments like that are not helpful or contributory. They simply have a
tendency to piss people off. I seem to recall you lecturing somone on
this thread about how this or that behavior would cause the person to not
make many friends. Accusing others of "want(ing) a free ride....."etc.
is just a way to disregard the real thrust of what is being discussed
here and instead lower the quality of the discourse to a level you are
for some reason more comfortable with.

If you feel that a repeater owner has the right to operate a coordinated
machine any way he wants, and so forth, that's your privilege. I may
disagree with you, and that too is my privilege. Discussing it in a
gentlemanly way is both our privileges. But let's try to keep the
discussion at a higher level than name calling.

73
--

rogjd@netcom.com
                                    Glendale, CA
                                    AB6WR

Date: Sat, 4 Jun 1994 21:44:20 GMT
From: brunix!pstc3.pstc.brown.edu!md@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Ham Radio few problem
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

jws@fc.hp.com (John Schmidt) writes:

> Just my opinion, but I view PL as more of a necessity to clean operation than
> an access mechanism. My personal idea of an effective access restriction would
> be to require a tone sequence on a control frequency to open the repeat
> function, or a digital-burst squelch type of mechanism on the input frequency.

And neither of these methods are realistic for normal, end-user access
to the machine. Perhaps for control functions, but certainly not for
everyday access. Some reasons why:

1. The equipment to perform this function is not widely available to a
   majority of users within the existing radios sold by equipment
   manufacturers (although some are starting to include DTMF squelch as
   "standard" options).

2. Requiring a third frequency for control purposes reduces the amount of
   available bandwidth for others to use. Now a repeater will take three
   frequencies instead of two.

3. The complexity of activating the machine may be more complicated than
   some people can understand properly.

> All I said was that if a particular trustee doesn't want a particular
> ham operating on a machine, then the trustee needs to either shut it off or
> use an effective access mechanism.

There is no such thing as an "effective access mechanism". PL, DTMF
squelch - they all can be broken in a matter of seconds if you have the
right equipment. Activation via a third control frequency is not
practical - its simply not possible without additional equipment or
modification to existing equipment.

About the only way to truely restrict access would be to use a RF
key-down signature fingerprint and compare it against a database of
valid users. Even this is not practical - the amount of time required to
take a snapshot at keydown, look up in the database, find a match, and
open the squelch would clip the first second off each person's
transmission. Not to mention we generally don't authorize radios, we
authorize people, to use closed machines.

> I do believe that while there
> are a few exceptions, repeater operators that maintain "closed" systems do
> not
> serve either the amateur community or the public as a whole as effectively
> as open systems.

Subjective value judgement.

> The only constraint is that you're expected to join a group if want
> access to autopatches.

Well, we ought to de-coordinate them in favor of machines with completely
FREE autopatch access, damnit! Why should the cost of running an
autopatch be any different than the cost of electricity, site rental,
or maintenance? Open up those frequencies to someone who is willing to
give free autopatch. That's certainly serving the amateur community or
the public as a whole more effectively than a machine with a members-only
autopatch does.

MD
--
-- Michael P. Deignan
-- Amalgamated Baby Seal Poachers Union, Local 101
-- "Get 'The Club'... Endorsed by Baby Seal poachers everywhere..."

Date: Sat, 4 Jun 1994 13:43:52 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!agate!news.ossi.com!news.fai.com!amdahl!juts.ccc.amdahl.com!
szb50@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Loop Antenna
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

        I worked all over Europe on 40m from here in G-land with a 4foot
diameter loop indoors. I could turn it to null out the local QRN from
power lines, running only 7 watts, due to the poor capacitor I was using.

I have one for 80m now, compared it with a not too higher straight
G5RV, sometimes one was better than the other.
        One G-station reported that when his beam was destroyed by high
winds, he made a loop, stuck it on top of his tower and had no difficulty
in maintaining his daily sked with VK using 60 watts.
        Would suggest building one (a lash-up would do), give it a try, you'll
be tickled pink at the performance.
73 ..... Sid .... G3VBV...... Amdahl(UK).......

Date: Sat, 4 Jun 1994 21:25:30 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!agate!library.ucla.edu!csulb.edu!csus.edu!netcom.com!
joejarre@network.ucsd.edu
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <2sh2lq$b77@kaiwan.kaiwan.com>, <2shtbu$d8o@sugar.NeoSoft.COM>,
<rogjdCqq72H.6u4@netcom.com>
Subject : Re: 440 in So. Cal.

Roger Buffington (rogjd@netcom.com) wrote:

: Agreed, the closed repeater owners would have the same rights as the rest
: of us. They simply wouldn't have rights over and above the rest of us,
: namely, coordination for a repeater pair on a closed or private basis.

Roger, what you are suggesting is to take the rights away from the already
existing closed repeaters, not to fairly make the rights equal. This is
exactly analagus to some of the so called "equal rights" legislation that
came out in the 60's and 70's. The bottom line is both types of systems
are equal . . . in the eyes of the FCC . . . and that's as it should be.

: Once 440 reached the level of openess found on the model band, 2 meters,
: perhaps this could be relaxed.

In some parts of the country, read that "level of anarchy" found on the
model band, 2 meters.

: The current 440 coordination group has abused its authority recklessly.
: This can be seen quite clearly by the disuse into which Southern Cal's
: 440 band has degenerated.

I live in Texas, but I'm a welcome visitor to a number of those 440
"closed" repeaters when I visit southern California. On my 440/1.2 Gig
dual band talkie (notice no 2 meters), I hear lots of 440 (and 1.2 Gig)
activity. There may perhaps be paper repeaters, and that's not good.

: True, but the ones in Southern Cal are happy with the paper radios. If

: not, then why are they coordinated?

If SCRUBA is ignoring this, then they are at fault . . . but my guess is
they are not ignoring it at all. Until you have been a frequency
coordinator, don't be so quick to gripe. You don't understand their
problems.
--
****
* Joe Jarrett, K5FOG | *
* joejarre@netcom.com | This area   *
* Information Storage Devices FAE | intentionally left blank   *
* Austin, Texas | *
****

Date: 4 Jun 1994 14:28:49 -0700
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!news.cerf.net!ccnet.com!ccnet.com!not-for-
mail@network.ucsd.edu
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <rogjdCqq72H.6u4@netcom.com>, <1994Jun2.132403.14176@cs.brown.edu>,
<rogjdCqvLJD.K4J@netcom.com>
Subject : Re: 440 in So. Cal.

Roger Buffington (rogjd@netcom.com) wrote:
: Michael P. Deignan (md@pstc3.pstc.brown.edu) wrote:
: : rogjd@netcom.com (Roger Buffington) writes:

: : > Once 440 reached the level of openess found on the model band, 2 meters,
: : > perhaps this could be relaxed.

: : Why should this be a goal to achieve? Simply because 144/440mhz radios
: : are inexpensive today? If 440mhz doesn't present the level of "openness"
: : you like, then why not move up to 1.2ghz?

: Because like 40,000 other hams in Southern California, I've got a dual
: band 440/2m radio.

Why is it that 39,994 southern california hams are able to use closed
repeaters in the area, and just a hand full seem to have problems? Some
of the greatest abuses take place on the open repeaters. Whole groups
will shun newcomers or ignore them. Many open 2meter repeaters are by far
more closed in general attitude than many closed 440 repeaters. How about
all the open 2meter repeater groups with closed 440 repeaters for the
exclusive use of their supporting club members?

You might want to dump your 440 dual band radio while you can still get

ten bucks for it. Get a real radio maybe a tri-bander with 2meters, 6meters
and 1280Mhz. Your group of hams could have an open 1280 repeater operating
from any high level site in southern california this summer if you really
wanted to show the rest us us how well it works. I know it works better
than 440 any day, no radar or pager intermod. It works better than
2meters, not an other open beep-boop box 40 miles up the road.

If you want a good technical challenge, show us your open 6meter
repeater, there are frequencies available, and lots of cheep junk
equipment to use.

: : > The current 440 coordination group has abused its authority recklessly.
: : > This can be seen quite clearly by the disuse into which Southern Cal's
: : > 440 band has degenerated.

: : The only evidence I have seen related to band mismanagement posted here
: : by those who seek to eliminate closed repeaters from 440mhz are "paper"
: : repeaters being maintained by the coordinating body. And, while I agree
: : that this is improper, there are ways to deal with it above and beyond
: : eliminating closed systems on 440mhz.

In an other thread a fellow in San Diego posted " there were repeaters on
all the 440 frequencies." This goes to show that a paper repeater does
not last in a crowded market place.

: If you don't consider the relative non-utilization of an entire choice
: band, 440, prima facie evidence of bad management and coordination, well,
: OK. I and others do.

This is not a coordination management issue. What you are hearing is vary
poor management by the coordinated repeaters and remote base stations.
Management style can not be regulated by a coordinator. I would agree
there are many repeaters on all bands that are just empty warehouses.

I would suggest that there are not enough amateurs in southern california
interested in talking on 440 to make the band sound like the popular
watering holes found on some 2meter frequencies. Here in the san francisco
bay area most of the activity heard on a dual-band radio is from the
closed 440 repeaters. This was really brought to my attention by many
tourists visiting our area. They could not get over the shear numbers of
groups using the 440 band, nothing like it at home.

: : > True, but the ones in Southern Cal are happy with the paper radios. If
: : > not, then why are they coordinated?

: : The easiest way to deal with paper coordinations is to document no activity
: : on a particular frequency for a month, and when you hear nothing, quietly
: : place an open system on that frequency.

Most coordinating bodies have a take away procedure. Follow the local
procedure. Who wins when the paper repeater comes back to life when your
"quiet repeater" shows up on their coordinated frequency? They do! unless
you have followed the procedure and the coordinating body has taken away
the previous coordination. Remember you still have to get agreements from
the other repeaters on your frequency.

Following the policy and procedures of your local coordinating body is
: Not a bad idea, actually.

Bob

--
     Bob Wilkins   work   bwilkins@cave.org
 Berkeley, California   home   rwilkins@ccnet.com
     94701-0710   play   n6fri@n6eeg.#nocal.ca.usa.noam

Date: 4 Jun 1994 21:00:35 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!sdd.hp.com!col.hp.com!fc.hp.com!jws@network.ucsd.edu
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <1994Jun2.141129.18271@cs.brown.edu>, <2sl510$lbh@tadpole.fc.hp.com>,
<2sp2d2$qdm@ccnet.ccnet.com>
Subject : Re: Ham Radio few problem

> If PL is not an access restriction in the historic and common sense then
> touch-tone is not sacred.

Agree, tones on the imput frequency are not a very secure mechanism. I have
no clue what the FCC would say -- except that a tone sequence to enable a 2m
repeater would have to be on other than the input frequency anyway.
Just my opinion, but I view PL as more of a necessity to clean operation than
an access mechanism. My personal idea of an effective access restriction would
be to require a tone sequence on a control frequency to open the repeat
function, or a digital-burst squelch type of mechanism on the input frequency.

> Why do you want to shut off or deny the repeater group their pleasure?
> Please remember that the repeater or 40 meter net is on a fixed
> frequency. Your station has the ability to change frequency or bands at

> the flick of the wrist. The Commission has ruled at length on these
> issues in the many cases that have plaged nets and repeaters.

Huh? All I said was that if a particular trustee doesn't want a particular
ham operating on a machine, then the trustee needs to either shut it off or
use an effective access mechanism. A good access mechanism can be secure
and not deny access to any members of the "closed" group. If it makes it
slightly more difficult, then that's the price of exclusivity, IMO.
I certainly am not advocating sitting on the frequency to attempt a denial
of access type of attack on the "authorized" users. That would definitely
be considered malicious, and I would never advocate deliberate interference.
I just don't see how mere ordinary use of a repeater, while operating within
the rules, would fall into that category.

> John, your intent is showing...have you forgotten the rule about good
> amateur operating practice? This is the catch all... ;)

> Bob

Intent? No. Philosophy, probably yes. I personally would not continue to
operate on a machine if someone told me I wasn't welcome, unless an
emergency existed, regardless of legalities. (BTW - that hasn't happened
in 15 years of operating. But I haven't been to Rhode Island yet. :-))
I don't personally consider it a good practice and I've got better things
to do than to hang out where I'm not wanted. I do believe that while there
are a few exceptions, repeater operators that maintain "closed" systems do not
serve either the amateur community or the public as a whole as effectively as
open systems. Outside of a few experimenters with exotic setups, I don't
think there's any point to putting up a repeater if your intent is not
to do good for the community. If large chunks of 440 in California actually
sit idle while "occupied" by repeaters closed to all but a few, I think it's
an inappropriate use of valuable spectrum. At the very least, other open
machines could be coordinated co-channel with these systems, using
different PL's and mutual lock-out to eliminate interference. Coordination
does not guarantee exclusivity in the business bands -- why should it in
the amateur frequencies?

Repeater owners that whine about having users support the cost of their
systems as an excuse for operating a closed machine are usually just looking
for an excuse to play channel cop. I'm well aware of the costs of
building and maintaining repeater sites, having been involved with several
groups and getting up close and personal with the hardware many times.
I've yet to see a good open system that didn't pay its own way.

The largest and most successful systems in this state,
including a state-wide linked network, are run by groups that welcome all
users, and they have continued to add and upgrade equipment and services based
on voluntary donations and memberships. These groups provide all forms of

emergency and special event support, as well as regular access at all other
times. The only constraint is that you're expected to join a group if want
access to autopatches. Regular users are also encouraged to join -- usually
by receiving an invitation on the air or in the mail -- and many do. New
hams usually rapidly pick up on the idea that you should join the group(s)
whose repeaters you use the most -- without coercion. Occasional users and
travelers are always welcome. These open groups, in my opinion, are operating
in the intended spirit of amateur radio -- unlike those that seem to operate
on the concept that a user is not welcome unless invited to use their
private repeater, which usually serves no one but their (often few) members.

Probably my last word on the subject....

73,

John, NK0R